



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,265	04/15/1999	THOMAS J. OLSON	25771	3301

23494 7590 10/30/2003

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

WONG, ALLEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2613

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/292,265

Applicant(s)

OLSON, THOMAS J.

Examiner

Allen Wong

Art Unit

2613

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-6,9-12,15-17,22,25,27,29,40-43,46-49,52-54 and 56.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: all of the limitations of the claims have already been addressed in the previous Office Actions, paper no.14. Regarding remarks about claims 1, 22, 25 and 29, the examiner has already addressed issues and circuitous arguments about the Seeley and Gorr reference in previous Office Actions, paper no.12. Claims 1, 22, 25 and 29 have been amended to incorporate the use of a series of Cartesian coordinate pairs for identifying the objects movement path which Seeley and Gorr do not disclose. So, in response, the examiner introduces Williams to teach the use of a series of Cartesian coordinate pairs for identifying the object's movement path (see fig.1 and 7, also see claim 1; Williams discloses that the object can be displayed on a Cartesian coordinate plane, where (0,0), (200,0), (0,200) and (200,200) are Cartesian coordinates that are the vertices of the Cartesian coordinate plane). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Seeley, Gorr and Williams for permitting the computation, identification, storage and display of the objects in the Cartesian coordinate plane so as to clearly identify the objects at their specific locations. Doing so would convey accurate, precise detailed description of the moving objects' trajectory for reporting intrusion scenes. Further, the usage of cartesian coordinates to identify objects located at specific locations is well known in the art for many years since the days of Rene Descartes in the seventeenth century. Rene Descartes, the French mathematician, specialized in the development of analytic geometry, calculus, and cartography. With regards to the other dependent claims 3-6,9-12,15-17,27,40-43,46-49,52-54 and 56, these limitations with circuitous arguments have already been addressed in previous Office Actions, paper no.12.


HOWARD BRITTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER